



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in the United States. He gives no authority for this statement, which is not in keeping with the comparatively large importations and the frequent reprinting of books covering the field of political science, which marked the intellectual life of this country from the Revolution until well on towards the middle years of this century. At page 311 Mr. Kent states that Lord John Russell moved his resolution that corrupt boroughs be disfranchised and that the great towns and counties should be more fully represented in the same year, 1819, in which Sir Francis Burdett unsuccessfully moved for an enquiry into the state of representation. In 1819 Lord John Russell introduced his bill for the disfranchisement of Grampound; but it was not until 1822 that he laid his larger proposals before the House of Commons. Again at page 430 Mr. Kent states that "the Compensation for Accidents Act" was passed in 1896. The Workmen's Compensation Act was passed in 1897.

Mr. Kent is at his best in reproducing the spirit and color of the literature of the Radical movement; and his survey of this field, and his excellent presentation of the position of the several schools of Radicalism, and of the individual positions and opinions of the foremost exponents of these schools, would alone make his book of great value. There was a distinct place for the history Mr. Kent has written. The only books hitherto published treating of the history of the Radical party were Harris's *The Radical Party in Parliament*, and Daly's *The Dawn of Radicalism*. Neither of these covers the entire field. Mr. Kent's *English Radicals* does. It covers the movement in and out of Parliament; its literature; its journalism and its agitations; and it covers it in a way that cannot fail to be helpful and satisfactory to students of English party history since the middle years of the eighteenth century.

How England Saved Europe. The Story of the Great War, 1793-1815. By W. H. FITCHETT, B.A., LL.D. Vols. II., III. and IV. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. viii, 326; ix, 419; viii, 435.)

IN these volumes Dr. Fitchett brings to a close his work on the English wars in the period of the French Revolution and of Napoleon. Volume II. deals professedly with the naval operations from 1801 to 1808. It opens with Bonaparte's flight from Egypt to France and his establishment in the Consulate in 1799, but the narrative in the second, third and fourth chapters turns aside to English military operations on the Continent and in Egypt from 1799 to 1801. The relevant portion of the fifth chapter is largely a repetition of the first. The sixth summarizes the European situation in 1800. In the seventh chapter the reader first reaches the real topic of the volume in the Baltic operations against the Armed Neutrality. Apparently this unhappy arrangement is due in part to what has been a fruitful source of other defects in this work: with his history of the war the author, unconsciously perhaps, has attempted to combine a biography of Napoleon. The result is neither a

history nor a biography; it is proof that two paintings upon a single canvas are equally impossible in literary and pictorial art. This disarrangement in Volume II., aside from any question of its origin, is a typical instance of the disorder which characterizes Dr. Fitchett's work. Volumes III. and IV. are entitled respectively, "The War in the Peninsula" and "Waterloo and St. Helena," yet the first six chapters (78 pages) of the latter treat of the Toulouse campaign in 1814. Again allusion is frequently made to events as yet unnarrated; in fact general conclusions based upon these usually introduce the narration and are repeated at length and at random throughout it. Unfortunately these generalizations are not always trustworthy. At several points in this struggle Dr. Fitchett believes that a slight variation of the existing circumstances would have permanently affected subsequent history; on the contrary this entire contest is a striking proof that individuals and single circumstances even of the highest importance may retard, or hasten, but cannot alter the trend of history.

The grotesqueness in diction noted in the criticism of Dr. Fitchett's first volume is considerably abated here without disappearing entirely. To describe General Cuesta, Wellington's Spanish colleague in the Peninsular command, as having "all the obstinacy and not quite the intelligence of a Spanish mule," seems a trifle severe, and one can only imagine with what trepidation a respectable peninsula, such as the Peniche, will learn that it is jutting out from the mainland "like the bulbous nose on a drunkard's face." In allotting space to individual topics, a point distinct from the ordering of the narrative, the author appears to have been guided rather by a patriotic instinct than by reason. Twenty pages are devoted to the first bombardment of Copenhagen, in 1801. Of the second, in 1807, Dr. Fitchett is not equally proud: it is dismissed with two notices at an interval of twenty pages, the first of eleven, the second of thirty-eight lines, and ten of these record the trivial circumstance that the horse which carried Wellington at Waterloo was born on this expedition. The touch is characteristic. For the sake of an anecdote Dr. Fitchett interrupts at any moment the narrative proper.

In general one may say of this work that its author, as an historian, has many faults and some virtues. He brings enthusiasm to his task, and he is not consciously unfair—he gives the Prussians considerable credit for the result at Waterloo; but he is careless in composition, his judgment is perhaps rather hasty than superficial, and he is a victim of exaggeration and of prejudice. His work is an arsenal of anecdotes which may amuse. It is not history, and the vain-glory which it breathes and will inculcate, is not the spirit which has created the British empire and alone can preserve it.

H. M. BOWMAN.